UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/905,506	07/12/2001	Shell Sterling Simpson	10008181-1	3369

7590   10/18/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
SINGH, SATWANT K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2626	

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/905,506	SIMPSON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Satwant K. Singh	2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>*25 July 2005*</u>.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-25* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-25* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on *12 July 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   This office action is in response to the amendment filed on 25 July 2005.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-25 have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4.   Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dutta

(US 2002/0135800).

5.   Regarding Claim 1, Dutta discloses a method comprising: receiving a user

selection of one or more print options via a network service, wherein the one or more

print options are identified for subsequent resolution (Fig. 4) (page 6, paragraph [0061]),

and wherein the one or more print options can be applied to a plurality of other network

services (distributed data processing system may include the Internet with network 101

representing a worldwide collection of networks and gateways that use various

protocols to communicate with one another) (page 4, paragraph [0040]).

6.   Regarding Claim 2, Dutta discloses a method, wherein the network service

comprises an Internet imaging home page (Fig. 5) (page 6, paragraph [0065]).

7.   Regarding Claim 3, Dutta discloses a method, wherein the other network

services comprise one or more other printing services communicatively coupled to the

network service (Fig. 3, print filter interfaces with a browser application) (page 5,

paragraph [0053]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9.   Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dutta in

view of Potts, Jr. (US 6,314,432).

10.   Regarding Claim 4, Dutta teaches a method, further comprising: storing the one

or more print options.

        Dutta fails to teach a method, further comprising: receiving a user-selected name

for the one or.more print options; and allowing subsequent selection of the one or more

print options by the user based on the user-selected name.

        Potts, Jr. teaches a method, further comprising: receiving a user-selected name

for the one or more print options and allowing subsequent selection of the one or more

print options by the user based on the user-selected name (store printing options to a

specific directory/subdirectory) (col. 6, lines 14-29).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Dutta with the teaching of Potts,

Jr. to allow a user to save their print options under a selected name for later retrieval.

11.   Claims 5, 6, 8-10, 13-18, and 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Dutta in view of Davis et al. US (2002/0059489).

12.   Regarding Claim 5, Dutta teaches one or more computer readable media having

stored thereon a plurality of instructions that, when executed by one or more

processors, causes the one or more processors to perform acts including:

communicating a plurality of possible print options to a client computer (Fig. 4) (page 6,

paragraph [0061]); receiving a user indication of selected ones of the plurality of

possible print options (Fig. 4, dialog window for obtaining user preferences) (page 6,

paragraph [0061]); receiving an identifier, indicated by the user, associated with the

selected print options (Fig. 4, user preferences/selections) (page 6, paragraph [0061]);

saving the selected print options with the associated identifier (Fig. 4, button 404) (page

6, paragraph [0061])

Dutta fails to teach making the selected print options subsequently available to

the user for configuring of a plurality of printers.

Davis et al teach making the selected print options subsequently available to the

user for configuring of a plurality of printers (Fig. 1, printers 22 and 26).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Dutta with the teaching of Davis

to allow a user to print on a multiple variety of printers.

13.   Regarding Claim 6, Dutta fails to teach one or more computer readable media,

wherein each of the plurality of print options is not specific to a particular printer.

Davis et al teach one or more computer readable media, wherein each of the

plurality of print options is not specific to a particular printer (no printer driver exists for

the remote printer) (page 4, paragraph [0040]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Dutta with the teaching of Davis

to allow a user to print on a multiple variety of printers.

14.   Regarding Claim 8, Dutta teaches one or more computer readable media as

recited in claim 5, further comprising saving a plurality of sets of selected print options

and associated identifiers.

15.   Dutta fails to teach making each of the plurality of sets of selected print options

subsequently available to the user for configuring of a plurality of printers.

Davis et al teach making each of the plurality of sets of selected print options

subsequently available to the user for configuring of a plurality of printers (page 4,

paragraph [0040]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Dutta with the teaching of Davis

to allow a user to print on a multiple variety of printers.

16.   Claim 9 is rejected for the same reason as claim 9.

17.   Regarding Claim 10, Dutta teaches a graphical user interface, wherein one or more of the graphical mechanisms in the plurality of portions comprises a checkbox (Fig. 4).

18.   Regarding Claim 13, Dutta teaches a graphical user interface, wherein the other graphical mechanism comprises a user-selectable on-screen button (Fig. 4, box 404).

19.   Regarding Claim 14, Dutta teaches a graphical user interface, wherein the other graphical mechanism comprises a user-selectable on-screen button (Fig. 4).

20.   Regarding Claim 15, Dutta teaches one or more computer readable media having stored thereon a plurality of instructions that, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform acts including: receiving an indication of one of a plurality of sets of print options to be used in printing a document irrespective of a printer on which the document is to be printed (Fig. 4) (page 6, paragraph [0061]).

        Dutta fails to teach receiving an indication of one of a plurality of printers on which the document is to be printed; and communicating the indicated set of print options to the indicated printer irrespective of whether the printer supports one or more of the print options identified in the set of print options.

        Davis et al teach receiving an indication of one of a plurality of printers on which the document is to be printed; and communicating the indicated set of print options to the indicated printer irrespective of whether the printer supports one or more of the print options identified in the set of print options (page 4, paragraph [0040]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Dutta with the teaching of Davis to allow a user to print on a multiple variety of printers.

21.   Regarding Claim 16, Dutta teaches one or more computer readable media, wherein the plurality of instructions further cause the one or more processors to perform acts including: determining, based on the indication of the one printer on which the document is to be printed, which of the print options in the indicated set of print options is supported by the one printer; and communicating, for display to the user, an indication of which of the print options in the indicated set of print options is supported by the one printer (printer device context) (page 5, paragraph [0053]).

22.   Regarding Claim 17, Dutta teaches one or more computer readable media, wherein the plurality of instructions further cause the one or more processors to perform acts including: determining, based on the indication of the one printer on which the document is to be printed, which of the print options in the indicated set of print options is supported by the one printer (printer device context) (page 5, paragraph [0053]).

Dutta fails to teach communicating, for display to the user, an indication of which of the print options in the indicated set of print options is not supported by the one printer.

Davis et al teaches communicating, for display to the user, an indication of which of the print options in the indicated set of print options is not supported by the one printer (printer discovery process) (page 2, paragraph [0025])

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Dutta with the teaching of Davis to allow a user to print on a multiple variety of printers.

23.   Regarding Claim 18, Dutta fails to teach one or more computer readable media, wherein the plurality of instructions further cause the one or more processors to perform acts including: determining, for each of the plurality of printers, which of the print options in the indicated set of print options is supported by the printer; identifying one or more of the plurality of printers that support the most print options in the indicated set of print options; and communicating, for display to the user, the identified one or more printers.

Davis et al teach one or more computer readable media, wherein the plurality of instructions further cause the one or more processors to perform acts including: determining, for each of the plurality of printers, which of the print options in the indicated set of print options is supported by the printer (printer discovery process) (page 2, paragraph [0025]); identifying one or more of the plurality of printers that support the most print options in the indicated set of print options (printer discovery process) (page 2, paragraph [0025]); and communicating, for display to the user, the identified one or more printers (application 42 sends the document to file manager 44 with specific destination printer and print option information) (page 2, paragraph [0025]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Dutta with the teaching of Davis to allow a user to print on a multiple variety of printers.

24.   Regarding Claim 22, Dutta teaches a method, implemented in a print service coupled to a network, the method comprising: receiving, from a device in the network, a print request identifying both a document to be printed and a set of desired print options, wherein the set of desired print options includes a corresponding setting for one or more of the desired print options (Fig. 6).

Dutta fails to teach a method, checking whether a printer corresponding to the print service supports the desired print options; and for each option in the set of desired print options, applying the setting corresponding to the option if the printer supports the print option, and ignoring the setting corresponding to the option if the printer does not support the print option (printer discovery process) (page 2, paragraph [0025]).

Davis et al teach a method, checking whether a printer corresponding to the print service supports the desired print options; and for each option in the set of desired print options, applying the setting corresponding to the option if the printer supports the print option, and ignoring the setting corresponding to the option if the printer does not support the print option.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Dutta with the teaching of Davis to allow a user to print on a multiple variety of printers.

25.   Regarding Claim 23, Dutta fails to teach a method, wherein the print service comprises a print server corresponding to the printer.

Davis et al teach a method, wherein the print service comprises a print server corresponding to the printer (relay server 28).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Dutta with the teaching of Davis to allow a user to print on a multiple variety of printers.

26.   Regarding Claim 24, Dutta et al fail to teach a method, wherein the print service is implemented at the printer.

Davis et al teach a method, wherein the print service is implemented at the printer (local printer 22).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Dutta with the teaching of Davis to allow a user to print on a multiple variety of printers.

27.   Regarding Claim 25, Dutta fails to teach a method, wherein the applying comprises applying the setting corresponding to the print option if the printer supports the print option without regard for whether the printer is currently capable of carrying out the print option.

Davis et al teach a method, wherein the applying comprises applying the setting corresponding to the print option if the printer supports the print option without regard for whether the printer is currently capable of carrying out the print option (even if no printer driver exists) (page 4, paragraph [0040]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Dutta with the teaching of Davis to allow a user to print on a multiple variety of printers.

28.   Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dutta and Davis et al as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of Potts, Jr. (US 6,314,432).

29.   Regarding Claim 7, Dutta and Davis et al fail to teach making the selected print options subsequently available for user-selection by the identifier associated with the selected print options.

Potts, Jr. teaches teach making the selected print options subsequently available for user-selection by the identifier associated with the selected print options (store printing options to a specific directory/subdirectory) (col. 6, lines 14-29).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Dutta and Davis with the teaching of Potts, Jr. to allow a user to save their print options under a selected name for later retrieval.

30.   Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dutta and Davis et al as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Potts, Jr. (US 6,314,432).

31.   Regarding Claim 11, Dutta and Davis et al fail to teach wherein one or more of the graphical mechanisms in the plurality of portions comprises a data input box via which the user can input alphanumeric characters (store printing options to a specific directory/subdirectory) (col. 6, lines 14-29).

32.   Regarding Claim 12, Dutta and Davis et al fail to teach wherein the identifier of the selected print options comprises a user-specified name (store printing options to a specific directory/subdirectory) (col. 6, lines 14-29).

33.   Claims 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Dutta in view of Potts, Jr. (US 6,314,432) and Davis et al. US (2002/0059489).

34.   Regarding Claim 19, Dutta et al teach a system comprising: a network interface

configured to allow the system to communicate with one or more other systems via a

network (distributed data processing system may include the Internet with network 101

representing a worldwide collection of networks and gateways that use various

protocols to communicate with one another) (page 4, paragraph [0040]).

        Dutta fails to teach a system comprising: a printer configuration user interface,

communicatively coupled to the network interface, wherein the printer configuration user

interface is configured to allow a user of a client interface to select print options and

group the selection together as a configuration associated with a particular name, and

wherein the printer configuration user interface is further configured to allow the user to

select print options without regard for print options supported by a printer that the user

can subsequently print to.

        Potts, Jr. teaches a system comprising: a printer configuration user interface,

communicatively coupled to the network interface, wherein the printer configuration user

interface is configured to allow a user of a client interface to select print options and

group the selection together as a configuration associated with a particular name (store

printing options to a specific directory/subdirectory) (col. 6, lines 14-29).

        Davis et al teach a system comprising: wherein the printer configuration user

interface is further configured to allow the user to select print options without regard for

print options supported by a printer that the user can subsequently print to printer (no

printer driver exists for the remote printer) (page 4, paragraph [0040]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the invention to have combined the teachings of Dutta with the teachings of Potts, Jr.

and Davis et al to allow a user to a user to save their print options under a selected

name for later retrieval on a variety of printers.

35.   Regarding Claim 20, Dutta teaches a system, further comprising: a print user

interface, communicatively coupled to the network interface (print filter 320).

Dutta fails to teach a system, wherein the printer user interface is configured to

allow the user to select one of the configurations by its associated name, and further

configured to allow the user to select a printer that is to be used to print a document

using the configuration.

Potts, Jr. teaches a system, wherein the printer user interface is configured to

allow the user to select one of the configurations by its associated name (store printing

options to a specific directory/subdirectory) (col. 6, lines 14-29).

Davis et al teach a system, further configured to allow the user to select a printer

that is to be used to print a document using the configuration (printer discovery process)

(page 2, paragraph [0025]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the invention to have combined the teachings of Dutta with the teachings of Potts, Jr.

and Davis et al to allow a user to a user to save their print options under a selected

name for later retrieval on a variety of printers.

36.   Regarding Claim 21, Dutta fails to teach a system, wherein the print user

interface is further configured to allow the user to select one of the configurations

without regard for print options supported by the printer that is to be used to print the

document.

Davis et al teach a system, wherein the print user interface is further configured

to allow the user to select one of the configurations without regard for print options

supported by the printer that is to be used to print the document (even if no printer driver

exists) (page 4, paragraph [0040]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the invention to have combined the teachings of Dutta with the teachings of Potts, Jr.

and Davis et al to allow a user to a user to save their print options under a selected

name for later retrieval on a variety of printers.

Conclusion

37.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

Wikloff et al. (US 6,618,162) disclose an apparatus and method to configure a

device such as a printer over a network.

Fujitani et al. (US 2001/0034747) disclose remote printing systems and methods

for portable digital devices.

Ferlitsch et al. (US 2002/0113989) disclose methods and systems which enable

a user to distribute print tasks to a plurality of printing devices without the use of

additional hardware.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Satwant K. Singh whose telephone number is (571) 272-7468. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kimberly A. Williams can be reached on (571) 272-7471. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Satwant K. Singh
Examiner
Art Unit 2626

sks

KIMBERLY WILLIAMS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER